

### REMARKS

This application is under final rejection. The applicant has presented arguments below that the applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by the applicant's arguments, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendments to clarify issues upon appeal.

To expedite prosecution, the applicant has amended claims 5 and 19. Claims 1, 3-4, 15, 17-18 and 21-23 have been cancelled. Dependent claims 5 and 19 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of their respective cancelled base claims and intervening claims.

Claims 5-14 and 19-20 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

#### **I. The § 101 Rejections**

Claims 15, 17-20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The applicant has amended claim 19 to recite that the computer programs are tangibly stored on the computer readable medium as suggested by the Examiner. The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 101 rejections.

#### **II. The §102/103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15, 17-20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,968,177 ("Batten-Carew").

Claims 8, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten-Carew in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,181,803 ("Davis").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 4, and recites a method for autonomic administration isolation. The method includes isolating administrative

access to a plurality of client systems in a computer system via a data network. The method also includes issuing a trusted message from a data center to the at least one managed client system when the authenticated administrator system does have authorization to perform the service command.

A potential advantage of such a method is that system administrators never have direct access to a client's operating system log-ons or security credentials (specification page 5, lines 3-6).

Batten-Carew fails to disclose several aspects of claim 5.

*A. Batten-Carew Fails to Disclose Isolating Administrative Access to a Plurality of Client Systems in a Computer Network via a Data Center*

Batten-Carew discloses a secure communication system including an administrative entity, a serving entity, and one or more end-users. In operation, when the administrative entity has an administrative function to perform on an end-user, the administrative entity sends an administrative function request to the serving entity. The serving entity verifies the identity of the administrative entity and verifies whether the administrative entity is authorized to perform the administrative function request (col. 4 line 58 - col. 5 line 5). If the administrative requests is consistent, then the administrative request is either provided directly to the end-user, or back to the administrative entity, which will provide the information to the end-user (col. 7 ll. 8-15).

While Batten-Carew discloses that the serving entity can provide an administrative request (from an administrative entity) directly to an end-user, Batten-Carew also discloses that the administrative request is (typically) provided back to the administrative entity, which will subsequently provide the information to the end-user (col. 7, ll. 13-15). Accordingly,

Batten-Carew fails to disclose isolating administrative access to a plurality of client systems in a computer network via a data center.

*B. Batten-Carew Fails to Disclose Issuing a Trusted Message from the Data Center to at least One Managed Client when the Authenticated Administrative Does Have Authorization to Perform the Service Command*

In rejecting claim 5, the Examiner cites several portions of Batten-Carew – specifically, col. 4 lines 45-57, col. 6 lines 9-22, col. 7 lines 30-34, col. 7. 35-48, and col. 7 line 65 – col. 8 line 14 - as disclosing issuing a trusted message from the data center to at least one managed client when the authenticated administrative system has permission to perform a service command. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the cited portions, Batten-Carew discloses only the serving entity verifying a signature of the administrative entity, and the administrative entity verifying a signature of the serving entity. While Batten-Carew may disclose verifying authentication of the administrative system (“administrative entity”) by the data center (“serving entity”), Batten-Carew clearly does not disclose issuing a trusted message from the data center to at least one managed client system when the authenticated administrator system does have authorization to perform the service command (emphasis added).

Instead, (as discussed above) in Batten-Carew’s system, if the serving entity verifies an administrative request of an administrative entity, the administrative request is either provided *directly to* an end-user, or the administrative request is returned to the administrative entity (which will subsequently provide the information to the user) (col. 7, ll. 9-15). There is no mention in Batten-Carew of the serving entity issuing a trusted message directly to an end-user. Nor is it inherent that the serving entity provides a trusted message to an end-user. See MPEP

2163.07 - "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Claim 5 is, therefore, allowable over Batten-Carew.

Claim 6 depends from claim 5, and is allowable over Batten-Carew for at least those reasons that apply to claim 5.

*C. Other Independent Claims*

Claims 7 and 19 each incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 5. Claims 7 and 19 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over Batten-Carew for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 5.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims 5-14 and 19-20 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

November 4, 2005

Date

  
Kelvin M. Vivian  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 53,727  
(650) 493-4540